

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 6-29 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-5 are pending and under consideration.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are now discussed.

Independent claim 1 recites at least one shield member blocking and contacting a plurality of surfaces of at least one of the first and second magnets not facing the other magnet preventing a leaking of magnetic force therethrough. The Examiner admits that Keil does not teach the claimed shield member. Instead, the Examiner relies upon Frey. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's combination is not proper, because there would have been no motivation to make the combination.

Specifically, Keil teaches a magnet 41 with N-S-N poles arranged in a single row. Another magnet 92 is disposed opposite magnet 41, with S-N-S poles arranged in a single row. Because the poles are arranged in single rows, there is an attractive force between opposite poles. However, no repulsive force is generated from a pole that is *behind* the paired poles. This is in contrast to present Fig. 8, where the N pole of magnet 32 can repulse the N pole of magnet 31.

Thus, the arrangement of Keil does not require the provision of a shield member to prevent a repulsive force. For this reason, there would have been no motivation to combine the references.

Also, the frame 36 and front portion 36' of Keil prevent insulating material from permeating into the space where the magnet is installed, and are not to prevent loss of magnetic force. Furthermore, the magnetic sealing member 1 of Frey is moved and separated from the U-shaped guide 12 so that a magnetic force from surfaces of the magnet not facing the other magnet cannot be blocked. Thus, there would have been no motivation to provide a shield to prevent a leak of magnetic force in combination with Frey.

Hyodo does not overcome these deficiencies in Keil and Frey, and is not relied on by the Examiner to do so.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-19-07

By: 
Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501